REMARKS

1.   Applicant thanks the Office for the Office's comments which have greatly assisted Applicant in responding.

2.   **OBJECTIONS TO THE CLAIMS**
     Claims 1 and 8 are objected to due to an alleged informality. Claims 1 and 8 are amended to include the expression "computer implemented" as required. The present objection is deemed satisfied.

3.   **35 U.S.C. §103**
     Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-17, 19-23 and 25-26 are rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 6,154,738 ("Call") in view of U.S. patent application publication no. 2002/0083341 ("Feuerstein").
     Claim 1: The Office relies on Feuerstein, ¶¶ 0033, 0034 and 0100 as teaching or suggesting"
     "verifying integrity and origin of said substantive descriptive information concerning the resource by a recipient of said substantive descriptive information concerning the resource."
     Applicant respectfully disagrees.   Applicant first notes that the Office appears to misunderstand the Claim element. What is being described in Claim 1 is a recipient verifying integrity and origin, not of requested information, but of information about the requested information. Thus, the particular claim element has nothing to do with verifying integrity and origin of requested information, as posited by the Office.
     Feuerstein, ¶ 0033 has nothing to do with verifying integrity of received information about requested information. Rather, ¶ 0033 describes verifying the integrity of a resource, by the provider, prior to filling a request for the resource.
     Additionally, the Office relies on Feuerstein, ¶¶ 0034 and 0100 as teaching the element in question. The cited paragraphs describe Feurstein's security component formulating a descriptor for an information resource. The Office

posits that the security component reads on Applicant's " recipient of said substantive descriptive information concerning the resource" because the security component must <u>receive</u> the information resource in order to create the descriptor. The Office's Application of the cited paragraphs from Feuerstein is patently incorrect because the Claim language deals with verifying source and integrity of received information about an information resource, <u>not the information resource itself</u>. Thus, the security component "receives" the information resource and not information <u>about</u> the resource.

Although a broad reading by the Office of a reference is permissible, it must still be <u>reasonable</u>. Even if the Office's understanding of Feuerstein were not patently incorrect, the notion that the security component "receives" the information resource is unreasonable because it is such a distorted interpretation of the process that actually occurs: in order to create the descriptor of the information resource, the security component accesses the information resource at the appropriate address within a storage medium such as a disk or a memory and calculates a checksum or some other identifier. There is, therefore no teaching or suggestion in Feuerstein of "<u>verifying integrity and origin of said substantive descriptive information concerning the resource by a recipient of said substantive descriptive information concerning the resource</u>."

As the Office acknowledges, there is no teaching or suggestion of the above subject matter in Call. There is therefore no teaching or suggestion in the combination of:

"A process for using an association between a service provider resource and a fixed identifier to allow resource requestors to consistently access a service provider resource without being affected by changes to the service provider resource, the process comprising the steps of:

A process for using an association between a service provider resource and a fixed identifier to allow resource requestors to consistently access a service provider resource without being affected by changes to the service provider resource, the process comprising the steps of:

a central server receiving a resource information request from a resource requestor concerning a service provider resource;

extracting a fixed service provider resource identifier from said resource information request, said service provider resource identifier having a one to one correspondence with said service provider resource;

providing a resource information database resident on said central server that contains cross references from service provider resource identifiers to service provider resource information, said database containing resource information for all service providers within the central server's area of responsibility, said resource information for each resource comprising at least a universal resource locator (URL) and substantive descriptive information concerning the resource, said substantive descriptive information comprising a description of the resource;

said central server accessing said database using said extracted service provider resource identifier and retrieving service provider resource information comprising at least a universal resource locator (URL) and substantive descriptive information concerning the resource and comprising a description of the resource from said database;

wherein said central server verifies said resource information request concerning said service provider resource from said resource requestor before returning the retrieved service provider resource information; and

verifying integrity and origin of said substantive descriptive information concerning the resource by a recipient of said substantive descriptive information concerning the resource."

Accordingly, the present rejection of Claim 1 is improper. Claim 1 is therefore deemed allowable over the combination. In view of their dependence from an allowable parent claim, Claim 1's dependent Claims are deemed allowable without any separate consideration of their merits.

The foregoing remarks apply equally to the remaining independent Claims and their dependent Claims.

In spite of the foregoing, Claim 1 is amended to describe:

"verifying integrity and origin of said substantive descriptive information concerning the resource by <u>said resource requestor upon receipt</u> of said substantive descriptive information concerning the resource." Support for the amendment is found in the previously amended Claims. The present amendment merely describes explicitly what was previously implicitly described. Additional support for the amendment is found as previously indicated. Claims 8, 14, and 21 are amended in similar fashion to Claim 1 and are therefore allowable for the same reasons that Claim 1 is allowable. There is no teaching or suggestion in the combination of:

"A <u>computer-implemented</u> process for using an association between a service provider resource and a fixed identifier to allow resource requestors to consistently access a service provider resource without being affected by changes to the service provider resource, the process comprising the steps of:

a central server receiving a resource information request from a resource requestor concerning a service provider resource;

extracting a fixed service provider resource identifier from said resource information request, said service provider resource identifier having a one to one correspondence with said service provider resource;

providing a resource information database resident on said central server that contains cross references from service provider resource identifiers to service provider resource information, said database containing resource information for all service providers within the central server's area of responsibility, said resource information for each resource comprising at least a universal resource locator (URL) and substantive descriptive information concerning the resource, said substantive descriptive information comprising a description of the resource;

said central server accessing said database using said extracted service provider resource identifier and retrieving service provider resource information comprising at least a universal resource locator (URL) and substantive descriptive information concerning the resource and comprising a description of the resource from said database;

wherein said central server verifies said resource information request concerning said service provider resource from said resource requestor before returning the retrieved service provider resource information; and

verifying integrity and origin of said substantive descriptive information concerning the resource by <u>said resource requestor upon receipt</u> of said substantive descriptive information concerning the resource."

Accordingly, even if the present rejection were not improper, it would be overcome by the present amendment. The present rejection is therefore deemed improper/overcome.

4.   No new matter is added by way of the above amendments. It should be appreciated that Applicant has elected to amend the Claims solely for the sake of expediency in recognition of the Office policy of compact prosecution. Such amendments do not indicate agreement with the Office's position, nor are they evidence of intent to sacrifice claim scope. Applicant expressly reserves the right to pursue protection of a scope that it reasonably believes it is entitled to in one or more future submissions to the Office.

5.   For the record, Applicant respectfully traverses any and all factual assertions in the file that are not supported by documentary evidence. Such include assertions based on findings of inherency, assertions based on official notice, and any other assertions of what is well known or commonly known in the prior art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the Application is deemed in allowable condition. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims.   Should the Office have any questions regarding the Application, he is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at 650-474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,

E Ruzich

Elizabeth Ruzich
Reg. No. 54,416

Customer No. 22862